

0

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

The Court is in receipt of petitioner's objection to the Court's order denying his petition to file a motion pursuant to Rule 60(b), CR Dkt. 199, as well as his motion to remove, seal, and alter the Court's published decisions in this case, CR Dkt. 197.

The Court has reviewed petitioner's objection and finds no reason to reconsider its denial of his petition to file a Rule 60(b) motion.

With respect to petitioner’s request to seal the Court’s previous orders in this action, the Court observes that there is a “strong presumption in favor of access to court records” which can only be overridden if there are “sufficiently compelling reasons for doing so.” Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 331 F. 3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003).

1 Petitioner speculates that he will be the subject of violent acts by other prisoners if they
2 are able to access the content of the Court's orders in this action. Dkt. 197 at 1.
3 Petitioner's speculation alone, without any facts demonstrating that he has been
4 specifically targeted for violence based on the contents of the Court's orders, is
5 insufficient to demonstrate a compelling reason to seal the Court's orders. Petitioner also
6 fails to demonstrate a compelling reason to seal court records because the Court's orders
7 do not contain any sensitive information, nor do they contain any details about petitioner,
8 or the crime that he was convicted of, that are not otherwise publicly available.

9 Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** petitioner's motion to seal the Court's orders,
10 without prejudice to petitioner's refiling the motion when and if he can identify specific
11 facts demonstrating that he has been targeted for violence based on information that can
12 only be found in the Court's filed orders.

13 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14
15 DATED: July 17, 2019

Christina A. Snyder

16
17 CHRISTINA A. SNYDER
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28